

## Supplementary Table 2: GRADE summary of findings and certainty of evidence for each outcome domain

Health literacy interventions on anxious and depressive symptomatology in Primary Health Care													
Population/setting: Adult population of Primary Health Care.													
Intervention: Health literacy interventions													
Co	<b>mparison:</b> Usu	ıal Care in Primary Hea	alth Care										
Outcome: Improvement of anxious and depressive symptomatology													
Outcomes		Risk with no	Risk with	Effect estimate	No. of	Duration	Certainty of the	Comments					
		intervention	intervention	[95% CI]	participants	intervention	evidence						
			[95% CI]		(studies)	(weeks)	(GRADE)						
1. Improvement of depressive symptomatology.													
1.1. Digital systems HL interventions decrease depression scores.													
EFFECT SIZE													
a)	↓ PHQ-9	Mean PHQ-9 score	Mean 2.33 pts	SMD -1.891	397	Mean 16 weeks		- Downgraded for serious inconsistency as heterogeneity (I2 > 75% in					
	scores	8.14	lower	[-2.319, -1.463]	(2 studies)	(Range 4-52)	Moderate	meta-analysis)					
	(Range 1-27)		[-2.59, -2.06]	[,	(= ======)	(======================================		<ul> <li>Downgraded for suspected publication bias given impression from</li> </ul>					
			[,]				$\Theta \oplus \Theta \Theta$	funnel plot					
							<b>4 4 4 0</b>	<ul> <li>Upgrade for suspected positive influence of Residual Confounding</li> </ul>					
h)	↓ BDI-II	Mean BDI-II score	Mean 0.84 pts	SMD -0.028	202	2 weeks	Low	<ul> <li>Downgraded for serious inconsistency as heterogeneity (I2 &gt;75% in</li> </ul>					
	scores	8.48	lower	[-0.304, 0.249]	(1 studies)	2 WEEKS	Low	meta-analysis)					
	(Range 0-63)	0.40	[-1.04, -0.65]	[-0.304, 0.249]	(1 studies)		$\Theta\Theta\Theta\Theta$						
	(Range 0-03)		[-1.04, -0.03]					- Downgraded for RoB2 some concerns for bias					
								- Downgraded for imprecision					
								- Downgraded for suspected publication bias given impression from					
								funnel plot					
								- Downgraded for suspected negative influence of Residual					
								Confounding					
	1.2. H	L group intervention	s decrease depress	ion scores.									
			Т	1	T	EFFECT SIZE	1						
-	↓PHQ-9	Mean PHQ-9 score	Mean 2.34 pts	SMD -0.235	241	10 weeks	Low	<ul> <li>Downgraded for imprecision and indirectness</li> </ul>					
	scores	12.16	lower	[-0.547, 0.077]	(1 studies)			<ul> <li>Downgraded for suspected publication bias given impression from</li> </ul>					
	(Range 1-27)		[-3.61, -1.06]				$\oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus$	funnel plot					
								<ul> <li>Downgraded for suspected negative influence of Residual</li> </ul>					
								Confounding					
b) ,	↓ GSD-5	Mean GSD-5 score	Mean <b>1.18 pts</b>	SMD -0.499	418	Mean 18 weeks	Moderate	- Downgraded for indirectness					
	scores	3.15	lower	[-0.865, -0.134]	(2 studies)	(Range 12-24)		- Downgraded for suspected publication bias given impression from					
	(Range 0-5)		[-1.74, -0.62]				$\Theta \oplus \Theta \Theta$	funnel plot					
								- Downgraded for suspected negative influence of Residual					
								Confounding					
	1.3. H												
						EFFECT SIZE							
a)	PHO-9	Mean PHQ-9 score	Mean <b>7.30 pts</b>	SMD -0.571	228	24 weeks	High	- Downgraded for RoB2 some concerns for bias					
′	scores	14.3	lower	[-0.892, -0.251]	(1 studies)	21 110010	A A A	- Downgraded for imprecision					
	(Range 1-27)		[-8.42, -6.17]	[ 5.652, 6.251]	(1 5144105)		$\oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus$	- Upgrade for very large effect					
	(11111190 1 27)		[ 0.12, 0.17]			l	T T T T	- Opgrade for very large effect					

1.4. HL individual telephonic interventions decrease depression scores.											
EFFECT SIZE											
a) ↓ PHQ-9 scores (Range 1-27)	Mean PHQ-9 score 16.9	Mean 3.80 pts lower [-3.86, -3.74]	SMD -1.898 [-2.104, -1.692]	609 (1 studies)	16 weeks	High	<ul> <li>Downgraded for serious inconsistency as heterogeneity (I2 &gt;75% in meta-analysis)</li> <li>Downgraded for suspected publication bias given impression from funnel plot</li> <li>Upgrade for large effect</li> </ul>				
b) \( \text{CES-D} \) scores (Range 0-60)	Mean CES-D score 12.35	Mean <b>0.93 pts lower</b> [-1.11, -0.75]	SMD -0.512 [-0.512, -0.194]	216 (1 studies)	4 weeks	Low	<ul> <li>Downgraded for serious inconsistency as heterogeneity (I2 &gt;75% in meta-analysis)</li> <li>Downgraded for indirectness</li> <li>Downgraded for suspected publication bias given impression from funnel plot</li> </ul>				
2. Improvement of anxious symptomatology.											
2.1. Digital systems HL interventions decrease anxiety scores.											
					EFFECT SIZE	_					
a) ↓ GAD - 7 score (Range 1-21).	Mean GAD-7 score 6.09	Mean <b>1.86 pts lower</b> [-2.09, -1.64]	SMD2.318 [-2.786, -1.851]	397 (2 studies)	Mean 16 weeks (Range 4-52)	Moderate ⊕⊕⊕⊖	<ul> <li>Downgraded for serious inconsistency as heterogeneity (I2 &gt;75% in meta-analysis)</li> <li>Downgraded for suspected publication bias given impression from funnel plot</li> <li>Upgrade for suspected positive influence of Residual Confounding</li> </ul>				
2.2.	IL individual telephon	ic decrease of anxi	iety scores.								
	T	1	1	,	EFFECT SIZE	1					
b) ↓ GAD - 7 score (Range 1-21).	Mean GAD-7 score 12.95	Mean <b>4.80 pts lower</b> [-4.85, -4.74]	SMD3.463 [-3.763, -3.191]	609 (1 studies)	16 weeks	High	<ul> <li>Downgraded for serious inconsistency as heterogeneity (I2 &gt;75% in meta-analysis)</li> <li>Downgraded for suspected publication bias given impression from funnel plot</li> <li>Upgrade for large effect</li> </ul>				
	n Difference; 95% CI: 95% Con gins y Thompson; Rob2: Cochr			re; GAD-7: Genera	al Anxiety Disorder; GDS	: Geriatric Depression So	cale; CES-D: Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale; BDI-II: Beck Depression				
	<u> </u>		EU NISK UI DIdS LUUI								
GRADE Working Group grades of evidence  High certainty $\oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus$ We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect											
Moderate certainty $\oplus \oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus$ Low certainty $\oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus \ominus$ Very low certainty $\oplus \ominus \ominus \ominus \ominus$ We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect											